



Criminal Justice Consortium

January 8, 2014 1:30pm – 3:30pm

Office of Financial Management

302 Sid Snyder Avenue SW, Room 440

Olympia, WA 98501

Meeting Notes

I. Introductions

Present: Keri-Anne Jetzer (OFM-SAC), Thea Mounts (OFM-SAC), Bryan Irwin (DOC), Michael Evans (DOC), Dawn Larsen (WASPC), Dan Schaub (JJRA), Elizabeth Drake (WSIPP), Lijian He (WSIPP), John Steiger (CFC), Jim Mayfield (DSHS-RDA), Alice Huber (DSHS-RDA), Stephanie Happold (AOC), Bob Marlatt (WSP), Alex Kigerl (WSU) on phone.

II. Data-sharing Agreement Model – Draft

Keri-Anne explained that she used AOC's data sharing agreement to create the model as suggested by the group. She noted she also used one from OFM's Education, Research and Data Center (ERDC) as it has been reviewed and approved by many agencies on sharing of education data. Keri-Anne asked the group for feedback on highlighted areas in the draft.

The group discussed hybrid datasets, such as what is the definition of a hybrid dataset? Do hybrid datasets fall under a separate area of data use under the model? It was suggested adding a clause for hybrid data or new variables created with use of data sharing data. Perhaps add another sentence under 9.5 that 'includes hybrid dataset'.

Michael suggested adding categories of data levels under the definitions. DOC determines the level of confidentiality based on data levels. Many other agencies are currently using these categories or are moving in that direction. Stephanie suggested looking at the DOL Data Security and Transfer section of their data sharing agreements.

Alice asked if this model was intended to be for sharing data between agencies represented in the consortium. Elizabeth suggested it may be helpful to include language on what the group's intents are regarding data sharing. Bob suggested

adding under Section 1 language regarding the principles, concepts and philosophy of what is being accomplished, i.e. assumptions.

Action items

Stefanie – provide language for 9.3 to make it more descriptive, to say that you cannot change the data and still state it is AAA’s data. Clarify between originating data and modified data by recipient. Perhaps 9.5 may cover the issue.

Keri-Anne – review the DOL data sharing agreement for categories of data levels related to data security.

Elizabeth – offered to provide draft language on the intents from her agency’s perspective.

III. Database Map - Draft

Keri-Anne asked the agencies to review the database map and respond to her with the RCWs that they believe cover the confidentiality of their respective databases as well as add any datasets that were overlooked or should be included. Bob suggested recognizing that some datasets are very similar, such as WSP sex offender registration database and WASPC’s Offender Watch, and to call out what the similarities and differences are.

Action item

All – respond to Keri-Anne with correct confidentiality RCWs citations and add any overlooked datasets.

IV. Criminal Justice Clearinghouse - Draft

Keri-Anne reviewed the tenets of the data clearinghouse. The group decided that a clearinghouse would be creating an extra layer of bureaucracy and added resources that are not really necessary. The group wondered if there is a way to protect state agencies when sharing data with another state agency from public disclosure requests for the requested data. Bob suggested an alternative where a data dictionary can be requested, more of a brokerage system, virtual warehouse or federated model. (Keri-Anne to get clarification on this at next meeting) Stephanie added that unless court rules were changed, AOC would not be able to participate.

V. Jail Booking Reporting System Flowchart

Alice mentioned that RDA has received some legislative inquiries for jail data and have been asked by legislators what changes need to be made in order to get the jail data that they are requesting. She didn’t feel that RDA could answer that question by itself.

Keri-Anne passed out the flowchart as well as two statutes related to jail data confidentiality. She explained that while creating the flowchart, she found that the jail data currently being distributed from WASPC is not being used because of a lack

of identifiers for merging. Dawn Larsen explained some of the aspects of the Jail Booking Reporting System (JBRS) data:

- The system was made to search for individuals in jail today, not for research.
- All jails don't enter in all possible variables.
- Access is limited to only 'criminal justice agency' as defined per statute.
- Some county attorneys limit what the jails can enter into the system because they say it is for investigative purposes only, based on their interpretation of statute.

Keri-Anne told the members that, per a discussion with Joan Smith at WASPC, the current jail data report that is distributed to OFM and DOC per statute was created for a specific purpose years ago. Joan said there are other variables that could be added to the report. It was noted that King County limits the information they provide to JBRS and strongly prefer requests for King County jail data come to them directly.

Elizabeth pointed out that obtaining an ORI from WSP (by meeting the definition of a criminal justice agency) is a data barrier. Dawn mentioned that WASPC has twice been denied an ORI because they do not meet the statutory definition of criminal justice agency. The RCW is 43.43.705. Bob remarked that WSP has arrest data, too.

VI. Next steps

Continue discussions on the data-sharing agreement model, the database map and the jail data. Also talk about public disclosure protection when sharing data and what agencies need to do to gain that. John suggested something similar to what the federal HHS has which is a waiver that legally protects you from divulging the data and no one can take you to court to reveal the data. Or require that any requests go to the source agency for that data. It was suggested to bring in a public disclosure expert to discuss the types of things agencies can do to protect ourselves and our data from public disclosure.